

# Lexicographical Notes, Illustrating Continuity and Change in Medieval Greek

ERICH TRAPP

In this paper it is not my intention to give a dry list of more or less common Greek words, taken from the collection for the “Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität” that is about to be published, but instead I shall restrict myself to discussing a rather small number of terms by selectively depicting them within the framework of Byzantine literature.

## PETROLEUM

Let me first draw attention to the word “petroleum.” More than eighty years ago Emmanuel Pezopoulos—one of those unfortunate lexicographers who, like Emmanuel Miller, spent their lives collecting a vast amount of material without managing to publish it as a whole—wrote a short history of this term in Greek.<sup>1</sup> I want to complement his remarks to a certain extent, by taking them as a starting-point for dating a problematic text. The essential facts are as follows: in ancient times the word *νάφθα* was usually used; it was written, for instance, in its less usual form *ἄφθα* by Constantine Porphyrogennetos in the tenth century, while a hundred years later Symeon Seth in his treatise on diet once speaks about *πηγέλαιον*, “oil issued from a spring.” As for *πετρέλαιον*, it is to be found in four Byzantine texts, for example in the oldest codex (tenth century) of the *Hippiatrica*,<sup>2</sup> along with the apparently distinct *πηγέλαιον*, as well as later in the *Thesaurus graecae linguae* (without any reference to a Greek source) and in the dictionaries of Polikarpov and Somavera, among others, at the beginning of the eighteenth century. As to its other occurrences, allegedly the first is in the description of the Holy Land by Epiphanius Hagiopolites,<sup>3</sup> generally assigned to the eighth or ninth century. Thus, we have a clear priority of the Greek term over the medieval Latin “petroleum,” which is quoted from a thirteenth century chronicle.<sup>4</sup> However, the date of the otherwise completely unknown Epiphanius is not so certain. Because an absolutely conclusive argument cannot be derived from its contents, let us now, departing from the manuscript tradition which begins around 1300, consider its vocabulary insofar as it throws light upon new phenomena. In

This article is an abridged, but annotated version of a lecture given at Harvard University in February 1992.

<sup>1</sup>*Αθηνά* 23 (1911), 126–29.

<sup>2</sup>Ed. E. Oder and O. Hoppe (Leipzig, 1924), 447, 28.

<sup>3</sup>Ed. H. Donner, *ZDPV* 87 (1971), 42–91; cf. *ODB*, 714.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. J. Niermeyer, *Mediae latinitatis lexicon minus* (Leiden, 1984).

fact, there are several examples of words pointing to a later date: the local adverb όπου used instead of a preposition with a relative pronoun, the noun χαλίκιν for “stone,” παράστρατα as an adverb “near the road,” μυσμός moaning (from μύζω; compare μύσμα in the Erotokritos,<sup>5</sup> not convincingly associated by the new editor Stylianos Alexiou with the ancient μύσσομαι “blow the nose”), βοασμός for “cry,” καταβασίδιον for “descent,” ἀνάβα for “ascent.” Two of these words, that is βοασμός and ἀνάβα, are attested in the twelfth, and another χαλίκιν, possibly only in the seventeenth century. But most impressive is the fact that παράστρατα and καταβασίδιον do not seem to be attested elsewhere except in the Pontic dialect,<sup>6</sup> to which fact one may add the Byzantine πεζούλιον “footstool,” which has survived in this dialect. Therefore, by means of vocabulary we have thus obtained two results: one, some new examples of the survival of medieval words, and two, a presumably later date for Epiphanius. As to the latter problem, we may now suppose that Epiphanius did not live before the twelfth century, and that therefore his treatise was written only after the beginning of the Crusades, just like the similar description of Syria and Palestine by John Phokas.<sup>7</sup> It is relevant to allude here to similar cases, in which vocabulary could furnish us with additional arguments for chronological limitations, even if they may not be conclusive, if taken alone. This has already been attempted for the Christos Paschon,<sup>8</sup> wrongly ascribed to Gregory of Nazianzos as even in modern times, and for John Kaminiates, who should remain a tenth century author.<sup>9</sup>

After this digression let us return to the word “petroleum.” As to its other Byzantine references, one belongs to the pharmacological treatise of the mysterious Nicholas Myrepsos<sup>10</sup> (around 1300?) and the other one to a rather curious dispute of earth and sea,<sup>11</sup> ascribed to Gregory of Nazianzos, but certainly a late work, probably written not earlier than the fifteenth century. To sum up, we may state that the generally employed term νάφθα, or ἄφθα, was only replaced with certainty by the modern πετρέλαιον in the tenth century; this became the model for Latin “petroleum.”

#### BREAD BAKER

Let us now pass on to the terms of baker, bakery, and bread—ἄρτος, later ψωμί. Since the latter word has been very well treated, especially by Paul Kretschmer and by Hans Eideneier,<sup>12</sup> we can restrict ourselves to looking at their survival or disappearance as part of a compound. Naturally we would expect that above all in more popular texts, where ψωμί(ο)ν begins to appear from the early Byzantine period and is very well attested from the tenth century onward, this word was employed for compounds too. But things were not so simple. On the one hand there still remained the strong influence of learned and especially ecclesiastical literature, which was even forming new compounds with ἄρτος,

<sup>5</sup>Cf. E. Kriaras, *Λεξικό της μεσαιωνικής ελληνικής δημόδους γραμματείας* (Thessalonike, 1969–), s.v.

<sup>6</sup>Cf. A. Papadopoulos, *Ιστορικόν λεξικόν τῆς ποντικῆς διαλέκτου* (Athens, 1958).

<sup>7</sup>Cf. H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, I (Munich, 1978), 517 f.

<sup>8</sup>S. Hörandner, in *Studien zur byzantinischen Lexikographie* (Vienna, 1988), 185–200.

<sup>9</sup>E. Trapp, *Η χρονολογία συγγραφῆς του “Περὶ ἀλώσεως τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης” ἔργου του Ἰωάννη Καμινιάτη ἐπὶ τῇ βάσει γλωσσικῶν δεδομένων* (paper given at the “Demetria” in Thessalonike, 1989).

<sup>10</sup>Pezopoulos I. c.; as for the author, cf., for example, *PLP*, 19865.

<sup>11</sup>Ed. T. Sinko, *Studia Nazianzenica* (Cracow, 1906), 309–12 (61–64).

<sup>12</sup>*Glotta* 15 (1987), 60–65; *Christliche Tabuwörter* (Munich, 1966).

like ἄρτοκλασία, “breaking of bread,” ἄρτοποιεῖον, “bakery,” ἄρτοφυλακεῖον, “pantry for bread.” And on the other hand, the Latin “manceps,” becoming μάγκιψ in Greek, exercised some influence, compare μαγκιπεῖον, “bakery,” μαγκιπεύω, “make bread,” μαγκίπισσα, “a baker’s wife,” etc. These special Byzantine terms have survived only in dialects.<sup>13</sup> Another one, likewise of Latin origin, appeared as a rival from the tenth or eleventh century: φουρναρεῖον, “bakery,” and φουρνάρης, “baker” (from Latin “furnus,” oven). And only afterwards, as it seems, ψωμᾶς, ψωμοπώλης, and ψωμιάρης were coined. Of course, it would be worth following the use of all these terms concerning bread and baking through the whole Byzantine period, but for this we shall have to wait for the planned extension of the *Thesaurus linguae graecae*. Nevertheless, it is now possible to put the additional question, of whether there are any proper names, etymologically connected with the terms mentioned before. However, in so doing, I must admit that I only have evidence for the Paleologian period, and am therefore compelled to refer only to late Byzantium. Since the *Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit* has just been completed, it is now possible to make the following statements:

1. There is no evidence for names derived from ἄρτος.
2. Only a few instances of the names Μάγκιψ, or respectively Μαγγίπισσα, can be given.
3. More productive was φοῦρνος, giving Φοῦρνας, Φουρνάρης, Φουρνία, Φουρνιώτης.
4. Especially in the empire of Trebizond (thirteenth to fifteenth century), there lived some landowners called Ψωμᾶς, Ψωμιάρης, Ψωμιάρόπουλος.

After this digression into the province of onomastics, let us ask how far a rivalry of terms can be observed, concluding this section by giving just three examples. An old one can be seen in the late antique or early Byzantine Philogelos, also known as “The jests of Hierocles and Philagrios,”<sup>14</sup> where ψωμίν is once employed for bread, but ἄρτοκοπεῖον for “bakery” and ἄρτοπράτης for “dealer in bread.” Passing on to later times, we may cite the instance of the synonymous ψωμοπώλης, which can be found only in the twelfth century (Theodore Balsamon), and is afterwards apparently not used (apart from its derivative ψωμοπουλητής, registered by Somavera in 1709). The usual terms remained either the learned ἄρτοπώλης or the vernacular ψωμᾶς. And in the beginning of the tenth century one section of the so-called Book of the Eparch by the emperor Leo the Wise<sup>15</sup> is inscribed Περί τῶν ἄρτοποιῶν ἥτοι μαγκίπων, which shows that then both terms seem to have been employed alongside one another without any difference.

#### CAVIAR

Still dwelling on the field of realia, let us now deal with caviar. We don’t know if there was any special term in use after or beside the rare ancient ἀντακάιον or ἀντακάιον τάριχος (ἀντακάιος denotes sturgeon). Since the eleventh century, at first in Symeon Seth’s

<sup>13</sup>Cf. Kriaras, Λεξικό.

<sup>14</sup>Ed. A. Thierfelder (Munich, 1968).

<sup>15</sup>Ed. J. Koder, CFHB 33 (Vienna, 1991), ch. 18.

treatise on diet,<sup>16</sup> we find the variety *ψοτάριχα*, “salted roe” (especially of the mullet), being apparently an equivalent of later Italian “botarga.”<sup>17</sup> And when in 1407 John Chortasmenos, the later Ignatios, metropolitan of Selymbria, wrote down his second report on his own disease, he argued that it could have been caused by “fruit, fresh bread, and caviar brought from Pontus to Constantinople” (καὶ τὸ ἐκ Πόντου κατακομιζόμενον ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει τῶν ἐκεῖσε ταριχευομένων ἰχθύων ὄν).<sup>18</sup> But in the meantime it seems that the Turkish term “havyar” was introduced as *χαβιάριον* and once as *χαβάρα*.<sup>19</sup> Here again, vocabulary renders a service for dating: a dreambook thought by its editor Drexel<sup>20</sup> to belong to the ninth century must have been written much later, because of *χαβιάριον*. *Χαβιάρια* and the vulgar *ἄβγοτάριχα* appear side by side with the learned *ψοτάριχα* in the so-called Ptochoprodromika and in a letter by the emperor Theodore Laskaris (middle of the thirteenth century). Even if a distinction between different sorts of roe must have been made, I suppose that the Ptochoprodromic *χαβιαροπούλος* is synonymous with *ψοταριχοπούλος* employed by the famous later humanist John Argyropoulos in the pamphlet against the judge Demetrios Katablatas Katadokeinos, derided by the author as Skatablatas. Though *ψοτάριχον* could have remained as the all-satisfying learned equivalent, also used by Adamantios Korais in the beginning of the last century, an attempt at creating other synonyms was once made. In Fjodor Polikarpov’s *Leksikon trejazyčnyj/Λεξικὸν τρίγλωττον/Dictionarium trilingue*,<sup>21</sup> for whose Greek word stock he was helped by the brothers and hieromonks Joannikios and Sophronios Lichoudis, we find the entry: *molóka* (“soft roe”), *τὰ αὐγοτάραχα* and then *ἰχθυόσπλαγχνα* “the intestines of fish,” or *ἰχθυόωα* “eggs of fish,” Latin “*intestina piscium*.” And as to caviar in its proper sense, Polikarpov lists “*ikrà rýbija*, *χαβιάρι*, but then he adds *τὰ ὠὰ τῶν ἰχθύων*, *ova piscium*.”

#### Ἀνεμομυλιάριον

The following isolated problem concerns word history as well as semantics. In the *typikon* for the Theotokos τῆς Κοτεινῆς monastery in Philadelphia, ordered by its founder Maximos, copper vessels are listed that were stored in the church or in a *μετόχιον* (dependency of the monastery). One of these objects is referred to as *ἀνεμομυλιάριον*.<sup>22</sup> By no means does the context allow us to think about something like a windmill stone, all the more as “a little mill” in Greek is *μυλάριον*, not *μυλιάριον*. If we examine this second part, *μυλιάριον*, we can easily find that it is known as a vessel (from Latin “*miliarium*”). As to the first part of the compound, however, it should probably be connected to the Byzantine and modern *ἀνέμη* “windlass.” Therefore, *ἀνεμομυλιάριον* could perhaps mean “a kettle hanging on a chain to be wound up over a fireplace.”

<sup>16</sup>Ed. B. Langkavel (Leipzig, 1868), 125.

<sup>17</sup>Cf. F. Tinnefeld, in *Studies in the Mediterranean World*, XI (Tokyo, 1988), 158 f.

<sup>18</sup>Ed. H. Hunger (Vienna, 1969), 209.

<sup>19</sup>A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Ἀνάλεκτα ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς σταχυολογίας* (St. Petersburg, 1891–97), II 147 (a.1122).

<sup>20</sup>Festgabe A. Ehrhard (Bonn, 1922), 94–118.

<sup>21</sup>Moscow 1704, reprint with important introduction by H. Keipert (Munich, 1988).

<sup>22</sup>Ed. S. Eustratiades, *Ἑλληνικά* 3 (1930), 332.

### Αὐλοφύλαξ

Another term deserving attention, is αὐλοφύλαξ, meaning “house guard,” that is found in Polikarpov’s lexicon. Αὐλοφύλαξ is listed by him as a synonym of αὐλωρός (this is Hesychian) as well as of οἰκοφύλαξ, rendering slavick “dvornik.” Not finding αὐλοφύλαξ in any current dictionary, one might of course be inclined to regard it as a neologism, perhaps coined by Polikarpov or rather by his two aforesaid collaborators, like many other ones which either appear for the first time in this lexicon or are completely unknown. But fortunately, in the third volume of the *Diccionario griego-español*<sup>23</sup> is the entry: αὐλοφύλαξ “guardián de la casa,” quoted from a papyrus from the third century before Christ! How should we judge this fact? Should we take it as a sign of survival over 2,000 years, like other linguistic phenomena linking papyrological and modern Greek, a point on which, for example, Kapsomenos had insisted?<sup>24</sup> However, in view of the fact that until now we have not found in any Byzantine text the word αὐλοφύλαξ, and it does not exist in modern dictionaries either, we should perhaps consider it to be a spontaneous parallel, clearly showing the strong persistence of rules governing the creation of new words in Greek from ancient to modern times.

### TERMS FOR BREAKFAST

The following remarks concern words for breakfast. In antiquity, either ἀκράτισμα or ἄριστον were employed for this meal, the latter word also often standing for “lunch.” A forerunner of the word that became successful in the late period, πρόγευμα, can be seen in the early Byzantine προγεύσιμον, “food taken before a meal.” However, ἄριστον must have remained the main term for some centuries, as may be shown by the compounds ἀριστοποιῖα, “preparation of breakfast” (employed by strategists) and ἀριστοποιός, “preparing breakfast,” once occurring in Theodore Studites’ catecheses. As to πρόγευμα, it apparently took a lot of time until it became successful as the equivalent of ἄριστον, a fact that can be proved by its first attested use in the new meaning of “breakfast” at around 1000 in the Life of Basil the Younger<sup>25</sup> (here it was followed, as nowadays, by γεῦμα, “lunch,” and δεῖπνον, “dinner”). However, a century later, Theophylaktos, archbishop of Ohrid, still took it as “foretaste.” Furthermore, this continuance of a double signification may be underlined by the following: in 1709, Somavera<sup>26</sup> understands προγεύομαι and προγεύσιμον only as “foretaste,” while in modern dialects both meanings are met. Meanwhile the italian “collatione” found its way into Greek language as κολατσιό or κολατσό, obviously attested for the first time in Leontios Machairas’ fifteenth-century chronicle of French-governed Cyprus, and in addition, nearly two centuries later in Venetian-ruled Crete.<sup>27</sup> If we return to πρόγευμα, and consider other lexica, we find the term is missing in Ducange, but is again mentioned by Polikarpov in this entry: “zautrennik, zavtrak, ἀκρατισμός, πρόγευμα, ientaculum.” And it is worth remembering that just a few years

<sup>23</sup>Published by F. Adrados et al. (Madrid, 1991).

<sup>24</sup>For example, in his “Voruntersuchungen zu einer Grammatik der Papyri der nachchristlichen Zeit” (Munich, 1938).

<sup>25</sup>Ed. S. Vilinskij (Odessa, 1911), 23.

<sup>26</sup>*Tesoro della lingua greco-volgare ed italiana* (Paris, 1709).

<sup>27</sup>Cf. Kriaras, Λεξικό.

later Somavera registered only the rival κολατζιοῦ. Furthermore, we should mention πρόφαγον, taken from De Cerimoniis, which Phaidon Koukoules<sup>28</sup> thought stood for “breakfast.” Yet John Haldon, the editor of the now so-called Constantine Porphyrogenitus, three treatises on imperial military expedition, in complete accordance with the context took it as “food for the next day.”<sup>29</sup> Moreover, we can cite with an even different meaning τὸ πρόφαιον, “hors d’oeuvre,” from a *typhikon*<sup>30</sup> as well as προφαγία “eating before” from the Life of Georgios Chotzibites.<sup>31</sup> Finally, there is, to my knowledge, no Byzantine quotation of τὸ πρωινόν (scilicet φαγητό), whose forerunner was the ancient τὸ πρωινὸν ἔμβρωμα, ὃ ἡμεῖς ἀκράτισμα καλοῦμεν (Athenaios, Deipnosophistai) “the morning meal, that we call ἀκράτισμα.”

#### NAMES AND WORDS

That Greek names in general and Byzantine ones in particular are largely connected with current vocabulary is very well known since the studies by Heinrich Moritz<sup>32</sup> and others. I shall content myself with quoting just the adjective καλοπράγμων, “he who does well,” to be found only in the Patria of Constantinople as an epithet of Emperor Basil II.<sup>33</sup> Yet in the twelfth century there lived a certain Calabrian monk and priest who was so called, and καλοπράγμων was once used afresh about one hundred years ago as a translation of the french name Bonne-chose.<sup>34</sup>

An instructive example for the metaphorical use of a proper name is Pontius Pilate. Looking at modern Greek we find the adjective πιλάτος, “tyrannic,” as well as πιλατεύω, “torment,” πιλάτεμα, “torture,” and others. Comparing these expressions with the similar usage of Pilate in a likewise disparaging signification in some regions of Romance languages,<sup>35</sup> we might suppose this to be a development of modern times. However the derivate πιλατήριον, standing for “prison,” is already attested in the fourteenth-century Chronicle of Morea, and the following passage also exists in the *Analecta hymnica graeca*<sup>36</sup>: Ὁ πάντα πιλατώδης Πιλάτος/ καὶ ἄθεος/ καὶ θεοκτόνος ὑπάρχων/ ἀγιοκτονεῖ τοὺς Χριστοῦ ἐραστάς, “The all-cruel Pilate, the godless killer of God, murders the holy lovers of Christ.” The epitheton πιλατώδης, literarily “Pilate-like” for Pilate himself, might look somewhat strange, but fortunately some time ago I came across a similar instance concerning Aphrodite in an astrological poem written by John Kamateros in the twelfth century<sup>37</sup>: ἡ Ἀφροδίτη πέφυκεν ἀφροδιτικωτάτη, “Aphrodite is most lustful.” As to the adjective, on the one hand we could compare the classic ἀφροδισιακός, on the other hand the Byzantine ἀφρόδιτος (a verse composed around 1100 runs thus: τὸν ἀφροδιτότατον ἐξώθει βίον, “drive away the most lustful life”).<sup>38</sup>

<sup>28</sup>Βυζαντινῶν Βίος καὶ Πολιτισμός (Athens, 1948–55), V 1, 137.

<sup>29</sup>CFHB 28 (Vienna, 1990), C 526.

<sup>30</sup>A. Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie liturgiĭskich rukopisej*, I (Kiev, 1895), 235.

<sup>31</sup>*AnalBoll* 7 (1888), 140.

<sup>32</sup>Die Zunamen bei den byzantinischen Historikern, Programm Gymnas. Landshut 1897–8.

<sup>33</sup>*Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum*, ed. Th. Preger (Leipzig, 1901–7), 283.

<sup>34</sup>S. Koumanoudes, *Συναγωγή νέων λέξεων* (Athens, 1900).

<sup>35</sup>W. Meyer-Lübke, *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 3rd ed. (Heidelberg, 1935), no. 6502a.

<sup>36</sup>I. G. Schirò consilio et ductu edita (Rome, 1966–80), II, 183.

<sup>37</sup>Εἰσαγωγή ἀστρονομίας, ed. L. Weigl (Leipzig, 1908), v. 1417.

<sup>38</sup>*BollGrott* 3 (1949), 28.

## INTERMINGLED WORDS

A chapter of medieval Greek that is not yet sufficiently investigated falls, so to speak, between both continuity and innovation, I mean the intermingling of different words or forms. Since it is not my intention here to quote well-known facts of morphological mixtures, like that of *verba contracta* ending in -έω with those ending in -άω, I shall rather draw attention to some new or obscure examples concerning semantics. Thus, we are now able to cite a dozen instances where ὑπο- in compounds takes the place of ἐπι-, so that no real difference can any longer be seen between ἐπιλούρικον and ὑπολούρικον in the epic of Digenes Akrites, both denoting “tunic worn over the breastplate.”<sup>39</sup> Furthermore ὑπομάνικον is interchangeable with ἐπιμάνικον, “cuff,” ὑπαύχενον with ἐπαύχενον, “ridge.” In documents ὑποκυρώω can be found and at least once also ὑποκύρωσις,<sup>40</sup> equivalents to ἐπικυρώω, “to confirm,” or ἐπικύρωσις, “confirmation.” Surprisingly absent from Caracausis’ lexicon is ὑποκτάομαι standing for ἐπικτάομαι, “to acquire,” in two Calabrian deeds. Another case, still to be investigated, is that of confounding εἶδον, “I saw,” with οἶδα, “I know,” partly due to phonetic identity. Let us be content with just one example: in a tenth-century letter<sup>41</sup> the feminine participle ὑπεριδυῖα, as if from nonexistent ὑπερ-οῖδα, undoubtedly takes the place of ὑπεριδοῦσα from ὑπερεἶδον.

## THE ARTICLE

The following concerns the article. Although the rather strict rules (including exceptions) in general remained valid, a few rare cases can be observed where the gender has changed in Byzantine Greek. However, I shall only quote those examples which are either found in more than one text or can be confirmed by modern evidence. A short reference to τὸ θρήνος instead of the usual ὁ θρήνος, “lament,” may be sufficient, especially as this change had been favored by metaplastic declension (θρήνος, -ους instead of -ου). The neuter is attested not only in late Byzantine vernacular literature as well as in modern dialects, but also in texts composed in a more learned speech from the tenth century onward. Certainly less known is the instance of ἡ παράδεισος, “the paradise,” a feminine form that can be cited seven times from Bartholomew of Edessa’s semi-vulgar anti-Islamic twelfth-century treatise<sup>42</sup> (it may be noted that one manuscript once corrected ἡ παράδεισος to the normal masculine). Furthermore, the feminine gender is attested in Ducas’ history, when he bewails the capture of Constantinople<sup>43</sup> ὦ πόλις, πόλις, ἄλλη παράδεισος, “O capital, capital, another paradise.” To cap these observations, who would not be astonished to hear such a thing as ὁ ὁδός? However, Andriotes quotes this from Cypriot as well as from Pontic dialects. But what about medieval evidence? One reliable reference can be given from an astrological text,<sup>44</sup> whereas others are manuscript readings, banished into the apparatus by the editors. As the first of these appears in the

<sup>39</sup>E. Trapp, *BZ* 75 (1982), 350.

<sup>40</sup>V. Mošin - A. Sovre, *Supplementa ad acta graeca Chilandarii* (Ljubljana, 1948), doc. I.

<sup>41</sup>J. Darrouzès, *Epistoliers byzantins du X<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1960), 363.

<sup>42</sup>*Confutatio Agareni*, ed. K.-P. Todt (Würzburg, 1988).

<sup>43</sup>Ed. V. Grecu (Bucharest, 1958), 385.

<sup>44</sup>*Catalogus codicum astrologorum graecorum*, ed. F. Cumont et al. (Brussels, 1898–), VIII 3, 170.

twelfth-century dialogue Anacharsis or Ananias,<sup>45</sup> assigned with certainty to the romancer Niketas Eugenianos, partly on lexical evidence, we are not allowed to ascribe the grammatical faux pas to the author, but to the copyist who introduced several similar alterations. Yet there still remains one example of a masculine compound. In the anonymous Life of Makarios Makres, who died in 1431, one passage, which has been corrected by the editor,<sup>46</sup> runs as follows in the manuscript: οἱ πρόσοδοι ὀλίγοι, “the incomes were little.” I think that the author himself put it down this way.

### Ἀπόβροτος

For the next problem, I cannot present a satisfactory solution. In Homer’s *Iliad* several verses contain the word βρότος, “blood that has run from a wound, gore,” always followed by αἱματόεις and preceded by ἄπο which, separated by tmesis, belongs to a fore-going verb, compare for instance θερμήνῃ καὶ λούσῃ ἄπο βρότον αἱματόεντα, “until she washes off the bloody gore” (*Iliad* 14,7). The accentuation ἄπο had been accepted by most manuscripts according to the authority of Herodian, who was followed by the Etymologicum Magnum and Eustathios of Thessalonike. However there must also have existed in a few manuscripts an understanding of ἀπόβροτος as a compound. And keeping this in mind, we have to explain the very astonishing fact that Nikephoros Basilakes, a rhetorician of the Comnenian period, in his first monody<sup>47</sup> alludes to the *Iliad* in the following way: ἀπέλουσέ σε τις τοῦ λύθρου μετὰ τὴν μάχην ἢ τὸν ἐξ ἀριστείας ἀπόβροτον αἱματόεντα ὥς κόσμον ἐντάφιον στέργεις ἔτι καὶ μετὰ τὴν τελευτήν; “Did someone wash the defilement from blood off you after the war or do you love the bloody gore due to your heroism like a funeral ornament even after death?” All this would not be worth mentioning, if an etymology were not based on this very misinterpretation. In the Ἱστορικὸν λεξικὸν τῆς νέας ἑλληνικῆς<sup>48</sup> we come upon the entry ἀποβροτίζω, “to soil,” derived from medieval ἀπόβροτος and quoted from Koumanoudes’ collection of Athesaurista. Besides the fact that a hundred years ago Basilakes’ monody was still considered to be written by Chorkios, a sophist living six centuries earlier, it is hard to imagine how from just one learned misunderstanding a derivate could emerge, only attested in the Pontic dialect, all the more as we would rather expect \*ἀποβροτώνω, formed like the ancient βροτόομαι and the Hesychian κατεβρότωσεν· ἐμόλυνεν, “he defiled.” If we look for additional information from somewhere else to fill this gap, at first sight it seems that a passage of the Life of Basil the Younger could help. In both versions of this text we meet with a largely identical description of the monotheistic heretics, running thus: ἦσαν ἀπεβροντισμένοι . . . ρυπαρὰ ἱμάτια . . . ἡμψιεσμένοι.<sup>49</sup> Considering the connection of ἀπεβροντισμένοι with the following “wearing dirty clothes,” we might be inclined to drop the Nu and take ἀπεβροτισμένοι as the much desired ancestor of its modern dialect offspring. However, I fear this explanation to be quite illusionary, because the neologism ἀποβροντίζω likely

<sup>45</sup>Ed. D. Chrestides, in *Μαρκιανὰ ἀνέκδοτα* (Thessalonike, 1984).

<sup>46</sup>Ed. A. Argyriou, *Macaire Makrès et la polémique contre l’Islam* (Vatican City, 1986), 208. For other examples of changed gender, especially in Modern Greek, cf. G. Hatzidakis, *Einleitung in die Neugriechische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1892), 354–373.

<sup>47</sup>Ed. A. Pignani (Naples, 1983), mon. 1, 336 f.

<sup>48</sup>Vol. II (Athens, 1939), s.v.

<sup>49</sup>P. 105, 22 (ed. Vilinskij).



meaning “to strike by thunder” can be derived from βροντίζω, although Pontic ἀποβροντᾶ stands in a quite different sense for “it ceases from thundering.”

#### TERMS FOR LEXICOGRAPHER

After these rather unsatisfactory reflections I think it worth mentioning the existing Greek term for those practicing the profession of a lexicographer. While γλωσσογράφος, “writer of glosses,” was used in ancient times since Strabo, in the sixth century John Lydos in his treatise on Roman magistracies employed the word λεξογράφος; later authors (John Tzetzes and some grammarians) preferred the variant λεξιγράφος. As to the usual λεξικογράφος, it is to be found first in the Etymologicum Magnum, requiring as a base λεξικόν, which was first used in the year 816 in a letter by Theodore Studites to his disciple Naukratios.<sup>50</sup>

#### ARCHAISMS IN MODERN GREEK

Let us now turn particularly to the field of archaisms in modern Greek, by first quoting the book by G. P. Shipp<sup>51</sup> and the much more comprehensive one by Nicholas Andriotes.<sup>52</sup> As to their linking ancient to modern Greek or dialectic vocabulary, we may be satisfied, but what about the reflections of Byzantium? Here I shall cite only a few instructive instances, to be considered as the quite incomplete results of a still unfinished comparison, in order to give a first impression of Byzantine survival, ἀμελγάδιον, with the meaning “milk animal, cow,” has been introduced by Andriotes as the source for ἀμεγ-άδι or ἄρμεγάδι, which occurs in some areas. Whereas the latter form ἄρμεγάδι is known from the Ἀκολουθία τοῦ Σπανοῦ, “Mass of the beardless,” a fifteenth-century satiric parody, we may further refer to the *typikon* of Gregory Pakourianos (eleventh century), where we find ἀμελγάδια βουβάλια and ἀμελγάδια πρόβατα “milk-buffalo” and “milk-sheep.”<sup>53</sup> Other examples of a similar Byzantine evidence for modern Greek vocabulary are ἐσωκῆπιον, “garden in a village,” κουμούλιον, “heap,” ποταμοφορία, “overflowing of a river,” and many others.

#### Λυχνιτάριον

As to the tradition of Greek vocabulary in old Russian, let me now pick out just one example from the “Devgenievo dejanie” (The Deeds of Digenes), an adaptation of the well-known epic poem of Digenes Akrites. When the young hero had come back from his first hunting adventures, his boots were described as being golden, set with precious pearls and “kameniem alignaretom.”<sup>54</sup> The editor corrected this to “magnitom” = “with magnet (stone),” following the late Greek version that presents μαγνήτας λίθους. But this has to be considered quite wrong, because the much more authentic Grottaferrata version<sup>55</sup> has λυχνίτας λίθους, “carbuncles.” Therefore, by correcting the Russian text to

<sup>50</sup>Ed. G. Fatouros, CFHB 31 (Berlin, 1992), ep. 152, 49.

<sup>51</sup>*Modern Greek Evidence for the Ancient Greek Vocabulary* (Sydney, 1979).

<sup>52</sup>*Lexikon der Archaismen in neugriechischen Dialekten* (Vienna, 1974).

<sup>53</sup>Ed. P. Gautier, *REB* 42 (1984), 125.

<sup>54</sup>Ed. V. Kuz'mina (Moscow, 1962), 146, 21.

<sup>55</sup>Ed. E. Trapp (Vienna, 1971), G 1170.

“kameniem lichnitarom” (this word in this very form appears in the Serbian Alexander), we get the underlying Greek λυχνιτάριον. And this word, standing for “any bright red gem, especially ruby,” is first attested in the ninth- or tenth-century description of the Hagia Sophia. By consulting Kriaras’ lexicon we see that references to λυχνιτάριον are given from texts of the fourteenth century up to the Oxford version of Digenes, written in 1760 by Ignatios Petritzes (in the form λυχνοτάριν); afterwards it probably disappeared.

#### DIALECTS

In our century the Greek language in southern Italy including Sicily has become more and more a special field of research. For the studying of the medieval Greek literature of that region, which was somewhat influenced by Latin language, we recently have at our disposal the very helpful dictionary by Caracausi.<sup>56</sup> Yet, since he has mainly concentrated on documentary sources, there are some no less significant—from the linguistic point of view—texts which have been disregarded by him, as is the case with some works praising Bartholomew the Younger, abbot of Grottaferrata in the eleventh century. One anonymous eulogy, written probably two centuries afterwards, represents an especially strange instance of the use of semi-atticizing vocabulary.<sup>57</sup> There we find many words which look somehow unusual, for example: ἀγιόχρυσά γράμματα, “holy and golden letters,” βροντόκτυπος φωνή, “thunder-resounding voice,” κοσμοπανεύφημος, “highly praised in the world,” παναγνομαρτύρητος, “testified as wholly pure.” One compound evidently shows Latin influence, namely, the mixed Greek-Latin κοσμόςσαλβος, “saving the world,” as epithet of St. Paul. In this respect I want to emphasize that literary texts of such a kind help us to understand the occasionally threefold tendency of documents originating from the monastery of S. Maria di Messina, which are characterized by a certain coexistence of archaistic, vernacular, and Latin forms.<sup>58</sup> I hope that future research will devote ever-growing attention also to the origins of other Greek dialects as proved by scattered elements in medieval works. By way of example, we may quote the Deeds of the Vazelonos monastery near Trebizond and the chronicle of Panaretos for the Pontic idiom, as well as Neophytos Enkleistos (around 1200) for the Cypriot (the works of Neophytos are much earlier than the better known translation of the Assizes for Cyprus and the historiographer Leontios Machairas).

#### Μονοκρατορικῶς

When about 100 years ago Stephanos Koumanoudes, having finished his still valuable *Συναγωγή λέξεων ἁθσαυρίστων*,<sup>59</sup> was engaged in his *Συναγωγή νέων λέξεων*,<sup>60</sup> he could not always be completely sure, of course, whether there didn’t exist any earlier reference to a supposed neologism. Nowadays such a quotation fairly often can be found in our material taken from more than 2,000 Byzantine texts. In order not to waste too

<sup>56</sup> *Lessico greco della Sicilia e dell’Italia meridionale* (Palermo, 1990).

<sup>57</sup> G. Giovanelli, *S. Bartolomeo Juniore* (Grottaferrata, 1962), 123–39.

<sup>58</sup> *Les actes grecs de S. Maria di Messina* (Palermo, 1963), nos. 17 and 21.

<sup>59</sup> Athens, 1883.

much time on this topic, I want to cite only one instance, that is the adverb μονοκρατορικῶς, “monarchically,” which we read in a speech by the thirteenth-century rhetorician Manuel Holobolos.<sup>61</sup> Koumanoudes, on his part, quotes both the adjective and the adverbial superlative μονοκρατορικώτατα. One might suppose that this fact would not deserve great interest, because it merely could be considered to be a spontaneous parallel. Yet against this hypothesis there stands Polikarpovs entry “edino-deržavno μονοκρατορικῶς, monocratorico modo.” Thus, by accepting this as a historical missing link, we should rather assume a continuous existence of the word.

#### HAGIOGRAPHY

It is certainly not useless to reflect upon the question of whether there were certain periods or authors exercising an important influence on either the persistence or the change of vocabulary. I hope that some more or less random observations may give a provisional answer. As it happens, substantial material is offered by the immensely productive hagiography of the early Byzantine period, which I want to characterize not by the best, but by the most curious example, namely, a vita devoted to St. Catherine of Mount Sinai, written about 600.<sup>62</sup> There are some passages in this work which turn out to be largely unintelligible, probably having been intended this way by the author in order to demonstrate Catherine’s insurmountable faculty of rhetoric in the contest against her learned pagan adversaries, although it is hard to imagine how far Byzantine listeners or readers were impressed by her hypersophisticated flood of words. Starting from the still understandable βιργίλιος, meaning “most wise (like Vergil),” we could perhaps link it with the ill-coined neologisms σφιρμιγγίλιος, σφιργιλλιούμενος, σφιρμιγγιλιодаπής, σφιρμιγγιλιωτρύπτως, and σφιρμιγγιλιούρθμιστος. A real Pandora’s box for a lexicographer who does not turn away from these horrible monsters! Another biography abounding in rare and unique compounds (more than fifty on ten pages!), though it is stylistically fairly normal, is that of the largely insignificant Samson the ξενοδόχος “hostaler” of Constantinople. I quote just one example:<sup>63</sup> Justinian’s general Narses is called the συναρχιστράτηγος, “fellow commander-in-chief,” of Belisar.

#### PERIODS OF CREATING NEW WORDS

A later period, undoubtedly characterized by the introduction of a great quantity of new words, coincides with Iconoclasm in the eighth and ninth centuries. Patriarch Germanos is to be considered the first example, especially from his homilies. The richness of his vocabulary has been fully recognized by Theocharis Detorakis only a few years ago.<sup>64</sup> And it has been shown that in several cases Germanos influenced his more eminent successor Theodore Stoudites who, obviously instigated both by his emotional temperament and by his strong inclination to be clearly understood even by ordinary men, sometimes borrowed from vernacular language and became the greatest inventor of new

<sup>60</sup>Cf. note 34.

<sup>61</sup>Ed. M. Treu, II, *Victoria-Gymnasium* (Potsdam, 1907), 65.

<sup>62</sup>Ed. J. Viteau (Paris, 1897), 26–35.

<sup>63</sup>Ed. F. Halkin, *RSBN* 14–16 (1977–79), 5–17.

<sup>64</sup>In *Lexicographica Byzantina* (Vienna, 1991), 101–15.

Greek words, to a quantity amounting to more than two thousand. It may be sufficient to mention that the monk Michael, one of Theodore Stoudites' biographers,<sup>65</sup> made considerable use of his hero's vocabulary. Much less known is the theological, especially hagiological, work of Patriarch Methodios I, but the innovative character of his language has to be valued too. As for the best known author of the Iconoclastic period, John of Damascus, in his theological treatises and summaries he doesn't make much use of new words, but in his hymns (canones) it is just the other way round. There he distinguishes himself by forming such Aristophanean (as to their length) compounds as ἀκτιστοσυμπλαστουργοσύνηθρονος, "uncreated fellow workers sharing the throne."<sup>66</sup> In this he is to be compared, for instance, with Constantine the Rhodian, who wrote satiric-pamphletic poems around the year 900, and to the late Byzantine Meliteniotes, who in his allegoric poetry on the personified Σωφροσύνη produced one fifteen-syllable verse consisting of merely two words:<sup>67</sup> στρογγυλοσφαιροσύνθετος οὐρανοκυκλοδρόμος, "round shaped like a ball and running like the celestial orbit." Even longer is Manuel Philes' twelve-syllable verse<sup>68</sup> φιλαντοφιλαργυροφιλοσαρκία, "loving oneself, loving money, loving flesh."

Disregarding isolated texts containing a lot of new words, like the aforesaid Life of Basil the Younger, let us pass over to the period of the Comneni. Lines of correspondence as to vocabulary seem to emerge between such well known authors as Theophylaktos of Ochrid, Eustathios of Thessalonike, and Niketas Choniates. A few instances may illustrate this: both Theophylaktos and Eustathios employ ἀγαθοχυσία, "shedding of goodness," οὐδαμινότης, "worthlessness," ταπεινοποιός, "humiliating," and other words; Eustathios and Choniates employ ἀνάσταθμος, "pulpit," διακηρύκευμα, "proclamation," φαυλοκόλαξ, "bad flatterer." Certainly, these are only examples picked out rather arbitrarily, that need to be extended to other authors, for instance, to the still insufficiently known Gregory of Antioch, or Constantine Manasses, who was in some way a link to the then-arising vernacular literature, or to Niketas Eugenianos, who to a large extent imitated Theodore Prodromos. In any case, the proof of some continuity of the vocabulary newly invented by them would be a good starting point for studying not the well-known ancient, but genuine Byzantine mimesis. Let me take this opportunity to pose the question of what Nikephoros Basilakes wanted to express by his new personal creations Βασιλακίζω and Βασιλακισμός. Did he not think in particular about his intention to introduce new words? We could imagine that a docile pupil of his may have been one John Diogenes, who introduced Christ in his speech on Manuel I Comnenos as the man who "makes weakly chattering tongues into grandiloquent ones" (γλώσσας ἰσχνολεσχεῖς μεγαλοφθόγγους ἀποκαθίστησιν).<sup>69</sup> To continue into the last centuries of Byzantium, we can state that during the period of the Nicaean empire the inclination to increase Greek vocabulary remained unbroken. One can cite, for instance, authors, like Nicholas Mesarites and Theodore Laskaris, who poured out an immense number of epithets to the praise of God, and Nikephoros Blemmydes. Examining the most important exponents of Paleologian literature, we get a partly different picture: some of them, like Theodore Metochites, Nikeph-

<sup>65</sup> PG 99, cols. 233–328.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. G. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford, 1961–68).

<sup>67</sup> Ed. E. Miller, *Notices et extraits de manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale*, XIX 2 (Paris, 1858), v. 976.

<sup>68</sup> *Carmina*, ed. E. Miller (Paris, 1855), II, 375.

<sup>69</sup> W. Regel, *Fontes rerum Byzantinorum* (St. Petersburg, 1892–1917), 305.

oros Gregoras, and the much less known Ignatios Kalothetos, continued to create new compounds to a certain degree; by other likewise outstanding authors, such as Nikephoros Choumnos, Demetrios Kydones, and the emperor Manuel II, were much more committed to traditional attic vocabulary.

#### CONCLUSION

To sum up, we should bear in mind that the period from approximately the time of Michael Psellos (middle of the eleventh century) up to the beginning of the fourteenth century was a period of great expansion of vocabulary, mostly coined according to the usual rules of learned language, but sometimes in a flowing transition to a more vernacular idiom. Later on, when innovation of vocabulary had more and more become the domain of popular literature, in atticizing theological texts we occasionally find a certain number of new compounds concerning adherents and opponents of Palamism, as for instance Ἀκινδυνίζω, Βαρλααμίζω, Παλαμίζω (“to be an adherent of Gregory Akindynos, Barlaam of Calabria, Gregory Palamas”).

Through the above observations on Greek vocabulary, I hope that I have shown several interesting, or at least unusual, words, forms, and meanings. However, if I now try to summarize with respect to the development of Greek language especially in the medieval period, I stress two facts, even if they are not completely new: on the one hand change very often took place much earlier than we are used to suppose, but on the other hand a great part of the older vocabulary survived alongside the new in certain areas or circles, thus hindering a too rapid and radical evolution of the language.

University of Bonn